



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

this help being given. As you all know the Chinese Government sent a warning note to Germany on February 9, 1917, severed diplomatic relations with Germany on March 14, and declared war on Germany and Austria-Hungary on August 14, 1917."

"In this connection it is of historical interest to make the following quotation from a dispatch written by M. Krupensky, the Russian Ambassador at Tokio, to his home Government, under date of February 8, 1917; 'I never omit an opportunity for representing to the Minister for Foreign Affairs the desirability, in the interests of Japan herself, of China's intervention in the war, and only last week I had a conversation with him on the subject. Today I again pointed out to him that the present moment was particularly favorable, in view of the position taken by the United States, and the proposal made by them to the Neutral Powers to follow their example. . . . On the other hand the Minister pointed out the necessity for him, in view of the attitude of the Japanese public opinion on the subject, as well as with a view to safeguard Japan's position at the future peace conference, if China should be admitted to it, of securing the support of the Allied Powers to the desires of Japan in respect of Shantung and the Pacific Islands. These desires are for the succession to all the rights and privileges hitherto possessed by Germany in the Shantung Province, and for the acquisition of the Islands to the north of the equator now occupied by the Japanese. Motono plainly told me that the Japanese Government would like to receive at once the promise of the Imperial (Russian) Government to support the above desires of Japan.'"

#### OFFER OF MAN-POWER TO THE ALLIES

China also emphasizes the fact that "a large contingent of Chinese workmen labored for the Allies behind the battle lines in Northern France. They eventually numbered 130,678. Not a few of them were either killed or wounded by enemy operations. In addition to these workers in France, a large number were employed in connection with the British operations in both Mesopotamia and German East Africa, and the crews of quite a considerable number of British ships were manned by Chinese sailors. Besides placing at the disposal of the Allied Governments nine steamers, which were greatly needed for the Chinese export trade, the Chinese Government offered to dispatch an army of 100,000 to reinforce the man-power of the Allied and the Associated States in France. The offer was favorably entertained by the Inter-Allied Council at Paris, and the French Government instructed their diplomatic representative in Washington to approach the American Government on the subject of arranging for the necessary tonnage for the transport of the men. Owing to lack of shipping facilities, the proposal eventually failed to materialize."

#### THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

Naturally China views the establishment of a League of Nations as a vital interest of a high order. She believes that it will "be a supreme expression of the intellectual and moral qualities of the modern mind; and that it will be assessed by history as the biggest achievement, not of today, but of all times." She thinks that

for Far Asia, "it will mean the continued independent existence of a nation with a continued life of myriad years, a nation long before modern Europe arose out of the ruins of old Rome, whose founders of great creeds taught them when tribal Europe was sacrificing to strange unknown gods."

### "UNMANIFEST DESTINY"

By WILLIAM J. TUCKER

Ex-President of Dartmouth College.\*

WHAT of our attitude to the nation, the object of our immediate and urgent concern? Can we do better than try to apply this injunction that we keep the faith in the sense in which I have tried to interpret it—as the power to adjust our minds to great issues as they arise? How constant and imperative has been the demand for the use of this power in our recent history. To recur to Richard Hovey's figure—with what rapidity have we been forced out of the region of our "manifest" unto that of our "unmanifest destiny."

For a century we lived in the security and pride of our isolation. That was our providential assignment among the nations. That was our "manifest destiny." It took but so slight a cause as the Spanish War to disabuse our minds of that fallacy and adjust us to our place in the world.

Then came our experience of neutrality. That, we tried to persuade ourselves as we shrank from the horrors of war, was our "manifest destiny." Upon the high authority of our President we were assured for a time that this was to be our distinction. "We are," he said, "a mediating nation—the mediating nation of the world." This was a fit conception as applied to our internal life, that of mediating among the races and peoples of which we are "compounded," but as a theory of our relation to the warring nations it soon became unsatisfying, then disheartening, and then a burden intolerable to bear, an experience too bitter to endure. The day when we disowned our neutrality was a day of emancipation. And today the joy with which we welcome our returning sons is in part the expression of our gratitude for our deliverance at their hands from our abject condition into the community of the suffering but exalted nations.

And now we are entering upon another stage in the disclosure of our "unmanifest destiny." What part shall the nation take in the use of its sovereignty? Certainly this is a great issue, in the minds of many a very grave issue. But it is here, and how shall we meet it? I can only answer for myself. I cannot allow myself to believe that we shall put such a construction upon the doctrine of sovereignty as will block the way in the further advance toward the realization of our "unmanifest destiny." I believe rather that "we the people" will allow, and if need be charge, the nation in the full exercise of its sovereignty to keep company with the great sovereignties of the world in the positive and determined effort to maintain the rule of justice, order, and peace. If a fellowship with this intent is to exist and we are

\*From letter to alumni of the college.

not in and of it, where are we? If it shall not exist because we took no sufficient part in creating it, what answer shall we make to history for the relapse of the nations by consequence into the state of elemental warfare?

Such is my response to the injunction that we keep the faith—the faith, that is, of the open, the courageous, the undistorted, the unconfused mind in the presence of great issues as they arise.

## EDUCATORS AND THE LEAGUE

[Straw votes taken by newspapers throughout the United States indicate substantial unanimity among educators and scholars of the universities and colleges in favor of the League of Nations Covenant in substantially the form as first announced. Appended are some typical opinions, mainly from teachers of history or international law.—EDS.]

PROF. A. B. HART  
Of Harvard University

This well-known historian, addressing the Chicago City Club on March 8th, said: "To assert that we should follow the doctrines of Washington simply because he uttered them is as absurd as to say that he should have been guided in 1796 by views expressed in 1689. I may add, moreover, that were Washington alive, he would be the first to repudiate his former conclusions and step into pace with the times."

PROF. GEORGE GRAFTON WILSON  
Of Harvard University

"The representatives of some States at the Peace Conference of 1919, seem to be holding the old ideas of balance of power, alliances, and other combinations, while others seem to appreciate the drift toward the recognition of a degree of world unity. Metternich, in his day, viewed the effort of peoples to obtain embodiment in national unities as 'absurd in itself.' So in these days some view 'the paramount authority of the public will' as did Metternich, but Metternich, and Francis Joseph, who connected Metternich's day with the twentieth century, have both passed away. As nationalism was not sacrificed, but, rather, when separated from provincialism, given a greater opportunity for self-realization through the development of internationalism, so nationalism and inter-nationalism, as is clearly shown in the demand for self-determination of peoples and for effective sanction for international rights, will not be sacrificed in the development of pan-nationalism, but will be offered an opportunity for development to a degree hitherto unknown.\*"

PRESIDENT A. LAWRENCE LOWELL  
Of Harvard University

A permanent peace cannot be achieved unless we form a league to maintain it. Even if isolation were possible, it would mean constant preparation for war, and the last four years have taught us what vast outlay that involves. The burden would be so heavy as to lower materially the standard of living. At a time like this purely destructive or carping criticism is out of place. This great question is not to be met by superficial arguments; irrelevant arguments based upon the advice of great statesmen of a hundred years ago,

\* The American Journal of International Law (January.)

but given under a condition that is wholly changed; infantile arguments based upon the fact that some of the other members of the league have as their symbol of national unity a king who reigns, but does not govern; futile arguments founded upon the assertion that it is unconstitutional to provide by treaty that we shall not go to war whenever we please; futile because Senators who use this argument have recently voted for the Bryan treaties with provisions that we should not go to war for any cause before submitting the matter to a commission of inquiry.

It is argued also that it is unconstitutional to form a league which has power to recommend to our country the limitation of armaments, when we have had for a hundred years a treaty limiting the armaments on the Canadian border, and have maintained it to the satisfaction of every one. We are assailed with plausible arguments that the league will destroy the Monroe Doctrine; whereas it extends the protection of the Monroe Doctrine over the whole world.—*Philadelphia Ledger*, April 5.

PROF. C. H. VAN TYNE  
Of the University of Michigan

The attitude which some prominent political leaders are taking toward the draft of the League to Enforce Peace is distressing. We cannot be a hermit nation any more—the progress of invention has determined that. Only by some real union with our allies can we secure the fruits of the victory which saved the world's democracies. If we cannot unite with our allies in the terms proposed in the draft in question, we almost certainly can hope for no other alliance. If in place of this plan we all—the United States, France, England, *et al.*—go our own ways, Germany will very soon drive a diplomatic wedge between us, and we shall lose all the guarantees of the dominance of the democratic, peace-loving nations which we have won.

Those who talk tragically of the overthrow of the Monroe Doctrine by the proposed League are, if they have carefully read the instrument, merely raising a cloud of dust to conceal their real objection, which they dare not disclose. Others, who mourn the passing of our "dear old Constitution" if we accept this plan, are raising a mere bogey.

After years of study of constitutional history and after the most careful reading and study of the League plan, I cannot for the life of me see what there is in the Constitution which would be destroyed by accepting this plan. If there is such a clause let us amend the Constitution. We have of late amended it repeatedly for much less important matters. Much of the opposition seems to be aimed at President Wilson personally.\*

PROF. ANDREW C. McLAUGHLIN  
University of Chicago†

"Now that America has won, what will she do—America, who cherishing, enlarging, and upbuilding the principles of British freedom for which the men of Britain had themselves struggled and suffered, America, who more than any other nation, unless it be the old and the regenerated England, is responsible for this spread of democracy through the last century and a half—what will America do? Well, we are told she will now live unto herself, scorn companionship, flout co-operation, shield herself from duty, assume ir-

\* Letter, *New York Times*, March 14.

† Convocation address at the University, February.